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Within the frame of the AFNOR SC11 French mirror committee and the RM Committee of the Association of French Archivists, we created an experts group working on EDRMS softwares and the metadata to implement. Indeed, in France and in Europe there are no "official" MD schema and it lacks both records managers and industrials. However, in France we have strong legal requirements for authenticity (probative value of digital writing, 2000). Charlotte Maday and Marion Taillefer have published an article in "La Gazette des Archives" in 2012, studying the requirements for MD in RM standards (ISO15489, ISO 23081, ISO16175 ...). Then we published the international White Paper on MD for RM in 2013. In 2015, we organized a study day on existing software and applications and their MD. The expert group studied a corpus of international and national MD schemas and established a list of minimal MD for RM (and compare with the needs of MD long-term electronic archiving, exchange standards ...).

The members of the group are : Walid Brahim; Agnes Ripoll-Ghys, Anne Poncet , Jean-Daniel Zeller (Geneva, Switzerland) Bernard Ouillon ,Charlotte Maday , Catherine Fernandez, Sylvie Forastier (Luxembourg) Frederic Grevin (New-York, USA), Marianne Aptel, Sylvie Dessolin-Baumann

with the support of : Lucas Colet (Luxembourg), Arnaud Jules, Michel Cottin, Sabine Mas (Montréal, Canada) Michel Roberge (Montréal, Canada) , Frédérique Fleisch.

A first step of the study was presented at the study day on 2 October 2015. We are currently engaged in a second phase, with further analysis. Indeed, we must still confirm with different countries and issuers institutions (because all schemes categorize and group the "sub elements" differently)

The study consists in comparing significant metadata sets, in order to define recurring information and produce input to define a minimal set of metadata. These sets are mostly based on existing RM standards requirements

They are issued from twelve organizations :

- 2 international sets (UN , EC)

- 6 national organizations/governments ( Great Britain, Australia, Spain, Luxembourg, Canadian Federal Government , Switzerland)

- 1 Canadian provincial government (Quebec)

- 1 French government department

- 1 French international company

- 1 French EDRMS software

As a result of this analysis, we identified recurring metadata elements. The most common seem to be:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total « Mandatory »  | Total « Optional”  | TOTAL SCORE |
| Identifier | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| Format | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Language | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Subject | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Type | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Creator | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Title | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| Description | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Location | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| Adressee | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Security & access | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Event history | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Date & time | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| Relation | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Disposal | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Function | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Preservation | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Aggregation | 3 | 1 | 4 |

(in progress, as in April 2016. Provisory list, to be confirmed and completed). We are still working further on sub-elements because all schemes categorize and group the "sub elements" differently, so the comparison is quite difficult. Definitions of medata elements : see annex

The public sets are available at the following links :

* UN : https://archives.un.org/sites/archives.un.org/files/files/Standards/ARMS\_Standard\_Recordkeeping\_Metadata\_Final.pdf
* EC  : [« Modalités d’application de la décision 2002/47/CE, CECA, Euratom concernant l’administration des documents et de la décision 2004/563/CE, Euratom concernant les documents électroniques et numérisés" , SEC (2009) 1643 du 30 novembre 2009. point IV.1](http://www.google.fr/url?url=http://ec.europa.eu/archival-policy/docs/edomec/2009-1643-sec_mda_fr.pdf&rct=j&frm=1&q=&esrc=s&sa=U&ved=0CBQQFjAAahUKEwjVt-u0itLIAhUGWxoKHQPOAcI&usg=AFQjCNHkxXXpdIrccOdrwmjBZUrrLQYnzQ)
* [Australie RKMS](http://www.naa.gov.au/records-management/publications/agrkms/index.aspx) http://www.naa.gov.au/records-management/publications/agrkms/index.aspx
* [Great Britain 2006](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/egms-metadata-standard.pdf%202006) http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/information-management/egms-metadata-standard.pdf 2006
* [Canada Federal Governement](http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/government/002/007002-5001-e.html) Government of Canada Records Management Metadata Standard <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/government/002/007002-5001-e.html>
* [Quebec Governement](http://www.banq.qc.ca/documents/services/archivistique_ged/Profils_metadonnees_gouvernementaux_Dos_Doc_version2_0_avril2009_VF.pdf) <http://www.banq.qc.ca/documents/services/archivistique_ged/Profils_metadonnees_gouvernementaux_Dos_Doc_version2_0_avril2009_VF.pdf>

Annex : list and definitions of the most common MD (from UN ARMS Standard Recordkeeping Metadata)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.Identifier**  | Unique identifier for an object, either on the file plan or within the system, be it an individual record (declared document) or an aggregation of records |
| **2.Title**  | The title given to the record, folder or class |
| **3.Subject (content)**  | Keywords or phrases describing the subject content of the resource |
| **4.Description** | Free text description of the resource |
| **5.Creator** | The person responsible for the content of the resource up to the point of declaration as a record |
| **6.Date (and time)** | Date (and time) an important lifecycle event occurred to a resource excluding disposal events which are sub-elements |
| **7.Adressee** | The person(s) to whom the record was addressed |
| **8.Type (type de document, typologie)**  | The recognized form a record takes, which governs its internal structure and relates to its transactional purpose or to the action or activity it documents |
| **9.Relation** | Identifies instances where a record has a direct relationship with that of another (content or a direct business process relationship) or clarifies how a record at one level of aggregation relates to other levels |
| **10.Function** | business function(s) which are documented by the record |
| **11.Aggregation (niveau d'agrégation : pièce, dossier…)**  | The unit of measurement used to define where in the information hierarchy any records management action is carried out : single document, folder… |
| **12.Language** | The language of the intellectual content of the record or resource |
| **13.Location** | Physical location |
| **14.Security and access** | Security classification restrictions and permissions placed on access to UN records held in ERK systems |
| **15.Disposal** | What happens to the records at the end of their lifecycle (can also be referred to as a record’s sentence or retention) |
| **16.Format/Media** | The format of the record or what media the information is contained in |
| **17.Preservation** | Information on the object description, migration, sustainability and preservation management processes that have been employed during the life of the record and its component(s), to facilitate its survival across technical platforms |
| **18. Event history** |   |
| **19. Accessibility** | Indicates the resource‟s availability and usability to specific groups. |
| **20. Publisher**  | An entity responsible for making the resource available. |
| **21 Source** | A reference to a resource from which the present resource is derived. |
| **22.Digital signature** | Authentication information used for the verification of resources intransactions. |
| **24. Coverage**  | The extent or scope of the content of the resource. |
| **25.Mandate** | Legislative or other mandate under which the resource was produced. |
| **26.Jurisdiction** |   |
| **27.Extent** |   |
| **28.Medium** | The physical ‘carrier’ on which a digital record is stored. For physical records, the material of the record. |
| **29.Integrity check** | A method for determining whether the bits that make up a digital record have been changed in the course of transmission or storage. Sometimes referred to as ‘fixity’. |
| **30. Document form** | Information about the recognised form the record takes, which governs its internal structure and relates to its transactional purpose. Document form can relate to the activity that a record documents. |
| **31. Precedence** | A mechanism by which the current time sensitiveness of a record can be flagged. |
| **32.Dissemination Limiting Markers (DLMs)** | A label that denotes the sensitivity of a record, mandate or business. |
| **33.Contact** | Information about how to contact an agent. |